

Abstract

This article addresses factors that influence VSC members' loyalty to voluntary engagement. The question asked is an issue of VSC volunteers' commitment whether they decide to quit or continue their engagement. A multilevel approach was used that regard both individual characteristics of volunteers and corresponding contextual features of VSCs to analyse members' voluntary commitment. Different multilevel models were estimated in a sample of 477 volunteers in 26 Swiss and German VSCs. Results indicated that members' stable voluntary activity is not just an outcome of individual characteristics such as having children belonging to the club, strong identification with their club, positively perceived (collective) solidarity and job satisfaction.

Keywords:

Voluntary sport clubs, social action, voluntary commitment, contextual features, multilevel analysis

Introduction:

Nonetheless, it should be considered that the purported decline in the willingness to volunteer has long been the subject of a controversial debate on the 'crisis of volunteering' in VSCs. Research also indicates that this purported crisis has not led to any reduction in the sport services offered by VSCs in the past (Anthes, 2009; Pitsch and Emrich, 1997, 1999). In particular, Pitsch (1999) has used the example of voluntary engagement in VSCs to discuss the problem of ideological influences on empirical research, and emphasizes deficits in the validity of measurements of shortages or crises in voluntary engagement. Nevertheless, sport club research does provide an ambivalent picture of voluntary engagement: Because voluntary commitment usually occurs within a specific organizational context, the unique

characteristics of the organization itself should also be considered (Studer and von Schnurbein, 2013). Nonetheless, it can be assumed that the risk of terminating volunteering among club members is not just an individual problem. Different contextual aspects such as organizational conditions in VSCs may lead to differences in collectively shared action orientations, and this may be accompanied by individual differences in motivational characteristics or perceptions of volunteering that influence voluntary behavior in terms of stability of engagement or time donated to volunteering. Thus, focusing on the organizational settings affecting volunteers sheds light on the ‘meso-level’ between the above-sketched micro-level of motives, sociodemographic characteristics and personal dispositions and the macro-level of societal values, government policies and social capital affecting volunteering (e.g. Haski-Leventhal et al., 2009; Hustinx and Meijs, 2011).

Literature Review

A review of the literature reveals numerous studies that have analyzed the personal characteristics of VSC volunteers such as their motives, personal dispositions and socio-economic characteristics (see Wicker and Hallmann, 2013, for a summary).

Going beyond socio-economic variables such as age, income or education level, several studies have performed theoretical and/or empirical analyses of the motives associated with voluntary engagement from a variety of perspectives and in a variety of different sport contexts (e.g. Braun, 2003; Emrich et al. 2014; Farrell et al., 1998; Flatau et al., 2014; Kim et al., 2013; Strigas and Jackson, 2003). These motives reflect the values and goals individuals attribute to themselves and associate with voluntary activity. In general, results from different studies on volunteer motivation indicate that motives are located on a continuum between an altruistic/selflessness orientation (‘wanting to help others’) and an egoistic orientation (‘pursuing one’s own interests’) (Braun, 2003). The majority of studies

support the notion that volunteering motivations are multifaceted; that is, they occur in combination with each other rather than in isolation (Rehberg, 2005). Because volunteers do differ in terms of their motivation for volunteering, one can find heterogeneous motivation-based profiles of voluntary engagement (Braun, 2003; Dolnicar and Randle, 2007). These diverging bundles of motives also help to explain why members engage in completely different activities and task domains (Clary and Snyder, 1999). Furthermore, volunteers' motives have been linked not only to demographics such as gender (Skirstad and Hanstad, 2013) or age (Hardin et al., 2007; Okun and Schultz, 2003) but also to the frequency of past volunteering in order to analyze the evolution of motivation over a volunteering career and the life cycle (Emrich and Pierdzioch, 2014; Haski-Leventhal and Bargal, 2008).

Although motives are a powerful factor when it comes to explaining why individuals engage voluntarily in VSCs, the issue of voluntary commitment is also linked closely to other aspects. Current studies analyze how other factors such as volunteers satisfaction or identification with the club relate to the intention to quit voluntary engagement in VSCs (Schlesinger et al., 2013), time commitment (Burgham and Downward, 2005; Hallmann, 2015) and long-term volunteering at sporting events (Kristiansen et al., 2015).

Whereas there is an extensive body of studies on individual-level determinants, there has been only limited research on how contextual aspects such as organizational conditions and structures influence volunteering. A systematic literature review by Studer and von Schnurbein (2013) emphasizes the relevance of the organizational context. It argues that the practices and instruments of volunteer management, and, even more strongly, the organizational attitudes towards volunteers as well as an organization's embedded values co-determined by social processes (integration and production of meaning) are crucial factors affecting volunteers. The review also addresses structural features such as volunteer management capacity that limit the action space of volunteers and volunteer coordination.

Concerning VSCs – as a specific sector of voluntary engagement – only a limited number of studies have focused on the organizational aspects associated with volunteering. First, comparisons in different voluntary settings (German Red Cross vs. German soccer clubs) reveal differences in voluntary motivation. Membership of the German Red Cross can be viewed as an ‘altruistic’ resource pooling in which members produce public goods mainly for non-members. Therefore, private consumption motives do not play a major role for voluntary supply (Emrich and Pierdzioch, 2015). However, in VSCs as interest organizations whose members produce goods for members, strong evidence is found for the private good consumption model (Hämmerle et al., 2014). Therefore, the taxonomy of altruistic versus egoistic resource pooling should deliver a more detailed understanding of motivational aspects in volunteering.

Further analyses are based mostly on data from comparative structural analyses in VSCs and reveal inconsistent findings. They show some effects of club size: VSCs with fewer members and a high share of members participating in social events have less difficulty in recruiting and retaining volunteers (Breuer and Wicker, 2010; Nagel, 2006; Scheerder and Vos, 2010). Furthermore, VSCs with high annual per capita revenues and no own facilities experience smaller problems in recruiting and retaining volunteers (Wicker and Breuer, 2013). Regarding organizational objectives, it becomes clear that VSCs that can be characterized more as solidarity-oriented communities that set value on conviviality reveal a stronger willingness for members to volunteer (Wicker and Breuer, 2013). Vice versa, the level of volunteering in more service-oriented clubs providing a wide range of courses (also for non-members) is lower (Nagel et al., 2004). However, findings on Norwegian VSCs reveal that the level of commercialization was already significant among clubs, and that increasing commercial resources did not necessarily hinder or crowd out voluntary work (Enjolras, 2002). Regarding the influence of volunteer management practices, particularly

Cuskelly et al. (2006) have investigated the efficacy of management practices in retaining volunteers in rugby clubs. Their results reveal that planning, training and support are associated with fewer problems in retaining volunteers. Alongside the positive effects of some volunteer management practices, however, VSCs that are guided by the idea of a service delivery organization and thus restrain individual choice for action through having more formalized work processes are less attractive for voluntary engagement (Hoeber, 2010; Nichols and James, 2008).

Despite the number of available studies, the state of research on voluntary commitment in VSCs is unsatisfactory in several respects. First, only a few studies relate the characteristics of volunteers to their club membership. Existing panel data or voluntary surveys seem to be rather unsuitable for analyzing such relations, because they are generally too aggregated. There is a far stronger need to gather data focusing on a club as a specific social context in order to obtain the most detailed information possible on different aspects of the relation between members and their club. Second, the available studies try to explain volunteering in VSCs separately on either the individual or the contextual level. There is a lack of analyses that consistently link together individual data from volunteers with the corresponding contextual conditions in their VSC as has been performed in other voluntary sectors (Bühlmann and Freitag 2007; Rotolo and Wilson, 2012). Although there have been calls for linkages between individual and corresponding contextual data within sport organization research for some time (Nagel, 2007; Wicker and Hallmann, 2013), from an empirical perspective (of willingness to volunteer: Schlesinger and Nagel, 2013; member commitment: Schlesinger and Nagel, 2015). However, we still know little about the influences of factors from different levels on voluntary commitment in VSCs, or about their interplay. As a result, studies fail to meaningfully explain why and how different factors exert an influence.

Theoretical Framework

Individual level

In this context, volunteers may well differ in the extent of their collective solidarity and identity with their club in line with club-specific socialization and integration processes – the social process through which individuals gradually acquire club-specific norms and a growing sense of belonging to a VSC (Flatau, 2009; Haski-Leventhal and Cnaan, 2009).

Contextual level

However, the notion of context should not be understood as descriptive but as analytical, in the sense that the package of features characterizing a context depends on which research question is being addressed (Boudon, 2014).

VSCs can be characterized in terms of their specific social structure as interest communities with an organizational logic based on self-organization and (egoistic) resource pooling (cf. Coleman, 1974). The basic idea of VSCs is to produce certain club goods such as sports and social services with the help of volunteer services, and to provide these goods exclusively for the utility and interests of their members. This results in a specific kind of motivation of club members to invest time voluntarily that simultaneously validates the private good consumption model of VSC volunteers (Emrich et al., 2012; Hämmerle et al., 2015).

The status of voluntary engagement within a club manifests clearly in measures to promote volunteering in the club along with the established practices of giving symbolic or material rewards (Cuskelly et al., 2006; Haski-Leventhal and Cnaan, 2009). Though it is generally held that low levels of bureaucracy and formalisation contribute to the satisfaction of volunteers, Musick and Wilson (2008) have argued that very low levels could alienate them.

On the one hand, this may raise the value of the social appreciation of voluntary engagement for members. On the other hand, the lower anonymity and the accompanying possibilities of sanctioning non-commitment (free-riding becomes more costly) lead to the expectation of higher voluntary commitment (Bühlmann and Freitag, 2007).

Method

Data collection

Club-specific data was obtained with a paper-and-pencil questionnaire by club managers (presidents, technical directors).

Measures

(‘How often in the past few months have you felt like quitting your voluntary engagement for your sport club?’) on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (*often*) to 5 (*never*). A total of 48.0% reported never; 18.4%, yes, but only occasionally; 17.8%, sometimes; and 15.8%, frequently and often combined. Hence, approximately two-thirds of volunteers could be characterized as stable and about one-third as unstable. Although the majority of those thinking about terminating their volunteering may well not actually do so, the risk of no longer volunteering was probably higher among those who had already entered into such a decision-making process.

The independent variables on the individual level were operationalized as follows: in a first step, individual preferences for (the utility of) volunteering are associated with satisfaction of one’s volunteering expectations. Volunteer job satisfaction is achieved when the expectations regarding working conditions are met (Chelladurai, 2006; Doherty, 2005). Therefore, a z-standardized index of volunteers’ job satisfaction was considered that covered

five dimensions of work conditions in VSCs (task design, leadership, material incentives, recognition and support) identified in a prior study (Schlesinger et al., 2013).

Here we differentiated between situational variables (e.g. number of members, number of divisions), variables regarding supporting volunteering (e.g. strategic planning, incentive structure), and variables representing the strategic orientation of a club.

Table 1 gives an overview of the operationalization and descriptive statistics of all variables on both individual and organizational level.

Data analysis

Insert Table 1 here

Results

If no variance in the dependent variable could be determined on the club level, contextual features of the clubs indicate no further variance and thus, multilevel analysis is not required (Hox, 2002). The size of the ICC was applied as a criterion to determine whether multilevel analysis was an adequate modelling strategy. The estimated random intercept-only model indicate that the variance of the individual-level residuals ($\text{Var } r_{ij}$) was 1.467 (see Table 2). The variance of the context-level residuals ($\text{Var } u_{0j}$) was 0.139. The table displays the variance components for both levels followed by the intra-class correlation coefficient (ICC). The calculated ICC was 0.087. This indicates that 8.7% of the variance could be traced back to contextual differences between the clubs.

The random-intercept model documents the estimation of all theoretically developed variables at the individual level (see Table 2). Within this model, the intercepts vary and the scores on the dependent variable for each individual observation are predicted by the intercept that varies across groups. Results showed a significant influence of five variables at the

individual level. A strong identification with the club, a positively perceived collective solidarity, satisfaction with the clubs working conditions and children belonging to the club had a positive influence on voluntary commitment. Whereas, the length of volunteering had a negative effect. Other individual factors such as gender, age, duration of membership or competition experiences had no significant influence on voluntary commitment.

power (Table 2). Results indicated three significant factors that explain club-related differences in voluntary commitment. More rural clubs, clubs in which supporting competitive sports is important and clubs that place value on conviviality revealed more stable voluntary commitment independently from individual characteristics. From a modelling perspective, it is advisable to remove the non-significant independent variables in subsequent stages to improve the quality of the model (Hox, 2002).

Furthermore, comparison with the deviance values ($-2 \log$ likelihood) indicated that the consideration of contextual data improved the model valuation, meaning that the model was adapted to the empirical data to a higher degree.

Insert Table 2 here

Discussion

Results show that individual expectations regarding the club's working conditions and whether these expectations are met were important. More satisfied volunteers exhibited a lower risk of terminating their volunteering. Moreover, having children who belong to the club also had a positive influence on voluntary commitment. This underlines the plausibility of the finding that having children currently belonging to the VSC had a positive effect on volunteer activities and therefore promoted the likelihood of stable volunteering (Burgham and Downward, 2005).

Clubs with in rural areas have more stable voluntary engagement regardless of the individual characteristics of their members. These increase the value of the social appreciation of voluntary engagement in the club and make free-riding more costly. This suggests that previous measures and strategies have either been less effective, or that a high level of formalization in VSCs might be less attractive for volunteers – as pointed out in previous studies (Hoeber, 2010; Stirling et al., 2011).

Future studies should include former volunteers of VSCs such as dropouts during the previous months, and also distinguish between different types of volunteering. Therefore, further studies should recruit larger samples, particularly at the context level. Additionally, more cases at the context level permit further analysis options such as random-slope models or cross-level interactions that would deliver a deeper understanding of individual behavior within contextual conditions. Researchers have assessed the necessary sample size at the context level and concluded that at least 30 cases are necessary to have correct standard estimates at the context level (Maas and Hox, 2004). Nonetheless, future research should specify the contextual conditions of VSCs such as material and immaterial incentives or opportunities for voluntary engagement more precisely. Finally, among the contextual conditions, the specific understanding and valuation of volunteering in VSCs varies across different sports systems and this could have different effects on the decision to engage in volunteering. Further research in various countries is needed in order gain more broadly generalizable findings.

References

- Anthes E (2009) *Strukturelle Entwicklungen von Sportvereinen: eine empirische Studie* [Structural developments of sports clubs: an empirical study]. Göttingen: Cuvillier.
- Becker GS (1976) *The economic approach to human behavior*. Chicago: University Press.

- Boudon R (2014) What is Context? *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie* 66: 17–45.
- Braun S (2003) Leistungserstellung in freiwilligen Vereinigungen. Über ‘Gemeinschaftsarbeit’ und die ‘Krise des Ehrenamts’ [Providing services in voluntary associations: ‘Community work’ and the ‘volunteering crisis’]. In: Baur J and Braun S (eds.), *Integrationsleistungen von Sportvereinen als Freiwilligenorganisationen* Aachen: Meyer & Meyer, pp. 191–241.
- Breuer C and Wicker P (2010) *Ehrenamt. Sportentwicklungsbericht 2009/2010 - Analyse zur Situation der Sportvereine in Deutschland* [Volunteering. Report on development in sport 2009/2010: The situation of sport clubs in Germany]. Cologne: Deutsche Sporthochschule Köln.
- Breuer C, Hoeckman R, Nagel S and van der Werff H (eds) (2015) *Sport clubs in Europe. A cross-national comparative perspective*. Heidelberg: Springer.
- Breuer C, Feiler S and Wicker P (2015) Sport clubs in Germany. In Breuer C, Hoeckman R, Nagel S and van der Werff H (eds.) *Sport clubs in Europe. A cross-national comparative perspective*. Heidelberg: Springer, pp. 187–208.
- Buchanan JM (1965) An economic theory of clubs. *Economica* 32: 1–14.
- Bühlmann M and Freitag M (2007) Freiwilligentätigkeit als Sozialkapital. Eine empirische Analyse zu den Rahmenbedingungen bürgerschaftlichen Vereinsengagements [Volunteering as social capital. An empirical analysis toward framework of voluntary engagement in organisations]. *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie, Sonderheft 47, Sozialkapital. Grundlagen und Anwendungen*: 163–182.
- Burgham M and Downward P (2005) Why volunteer, time to volunteer? A case study from swimming. *Managing Leisure* 10: 79–93.
- Coleman, JS (1974) *Power and the structure of society*. New York: Norton.

- Coleman, JS (1990) *Foundations of social theory*. Cambridge: Belknap.
- Chelladurai P (2006) *Management of human resources in sport and recreation* (2nd ed.). Champaign: Human Kinetics Publishers.
- Clary EG and Snyder M (1999) The motivations to volunteer: Theoretical and practical considerations. *Current Directions in Psychological Science* 8: 156–159.
- Cuskelly G (2005) Volunteer participation trends in Australian sport. In: Nichols G and Collins M (eds.) *Volunteers in sports clubs*. Eastbourne: Leisure Studies Association Publication, pp. 87–104.
- Cuskelly G and Boag A (2001) Organizational commitment as a predictor of committee member turnover amongst volunteer sport administrators: Results of a time-lagged study. *Sport Management Review* 4: 65–86.
- Cuskelly G, Taylor T, Hoye R and Darcy S (2006) Volunteer management practices and volunteer retention: A human resource management approach. *Sport Management Review* 9: 141–163.
- Doherty A (2005) *Volunteer management in community sport clubs: A study of volunteers' perception*. Toronto: The Sport Alliance of Ontario.
- Dolnicar S and Randle M (2007) What motivates which volunteers? Psychographic heterogeneity among Volunteers in Australia. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations* 18: 135–155.
- Downward P, Dawson A and Dejonghe T (2009) *Sports economics: Theory, evidence and policy*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Emrich E, Pitsch W and Flatau, J (2014) Voluntary engagement in sports clubs: A behavioral model and some empirical evidence. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport* 49: 227–240.

- Emrich E and Pierdzioch C (2014) Die Motive Ehrenamtlicher im Sport: Eine Lebenszyklus-analyse [The motives of volunteers in sport: A life cycle analysis]. *Spectrum der Sportwissenschaften* 26: 4-24
- Emrich E and Pierdzioch C (2015) Testing economic models of volunteer labor supply: Some empirical evidence for the German Red Cross. *Applied Economics* 47: 4247-4259.
- Engelberg T, Zakus DH, Skinner J L and Campell A (2012) Defining and measuring dimensionality and targets of the commitment of sport volunteers. *Journal of Sport Management* 26: 192–205.
- Enjolras B (2002) The commercialization of voluntary sport organizations in Norway. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 31: 352–376.
- Erlinghagen M (2003) Die individuellen Erträge ehrenamtlicher Arbeit. Zur sozioökonomischen Theorie unentgeltlicher, haushaltsextern organisierter Produktion [Individual benefits of voluntary work. Toward socioeconomic theory of non-paid, household external organised production]. *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie* 55: 737–757.
- Esser, H (1999) *Soziologie – Spezielle Grundlagen. Band 1: Situationslogik und Handeln* [Sociology – Special principles. Volume 1: Situational logic and action]. Frankfurt: Campus-Verlag.
- Farrell JM, Johnston ME and Twynam, G (1998) Volunteer motivation, satisfaction, and management at an elite sporting competition. *Journal of Sport Management* 12: 288–300.
- Finkelstein MA, Penner LA and Brannick MT (2005) Motive, role identity, and prosocial personality as predictors of volunteer activity. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal* 33: 403–418.

- Flatau J (2009) Zum Zusammenhang von Sozialisation und ehrenamtliche Mitarbeiter in Sportvereinen: Erste Überlegungen unter Anwendung der Rational-Choice-Theorie [Relation between socialization and volunteers in sports clubs: Preliminary ideas when applying rational choice theory]. *Sport und Gesellschaft* 6: 259–281.
- Flatau J, Emrich E and Pierdzioch C (2014) Einfluss unterschiedlicher Motive auf den zeitlichen Umfang ehrenamtlichen Engagements in Sportvereinen. [Influence of different motives on the temporal scope of voluntary work in sports clubs]. *Sportwissenschaft* 44: 10-24.
- Frey BS (1997) *Not just for the money. An economic theory of personal motivation*. Cheltenham: E. Elgar.
- Ivancevich JM and Matteson MT (2002) *Organizational behavior and management*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Hallmann K (2015) Modelling the decision to volunteer in organized sports. *Sport Management Review* 18: 448-463.
- Hämmerle M, Rullang C, Pierdzioch C and Emrich E (2014) *Die Sozialfigur des Ehrenamtlichen im Roten Kreuz – Ergebnisse einer vergleichenden empirischen Untersuchung* [The social character of the volunteers in the Red Cross - results of a comparative empirical study]. (Working Papers of the European Institute for Socioeconomic, Nr. 8). Saarbrücken.
- Hardin R, Koo G, King B and Zdriok J (2007) Sport volunteer motivations and demographic influences at a nationwide tour event. *International Journal of Sport Management* 8: 80–94.
- Haski-Leventhal D and Bargal D (2008) The volunteer stages and transitions model: Organizational socialization of volunteers. *Human Relations* 61: 67–102.

- Haski-Leventhal D and Cnaan RA (2009) Group processes and volunteering: Using groups to enhance volunteerism. *Administration in Social Work* 33: 61–80.
- Haski-Leventhal D, Meijs LCMP and Hustinx L (2009) The third-party model: Enhancing volunteering through governments, corporations and educational institutes. *Journal of Social Policy* 39: 139–158.
- Heckathorn DD (1989) Collective action and the second-order free-rider problem. *Rationality and Society* 1: 78–100.
- Heinemann K (1995) *Einführung in die Ökonomie des Sports* [Introduction to sport economics]. Schorndorf: Hofmann.
- Heinemann K (2004) *Sportorganisationen: Verstehen und Gestalten* [Understanding and designing sport organisations]. Schorndorf: Hofmann.
- Hoerber L (2010) Experiences of volunteering in sport: Views from Aboriginal individuals. *Sport Management Review* 13: 345–354.
- Horch HD (1998) Self-destroying process of sports clubs in Germany. *European Journal of Sport Management* 5: 46–58.
- Hox JJ (2002) *Multilevel analysis: Techniques and applications*. Mahwah: Erlbaum.
- Hustinx L and Meijs LCPM (2011) Re-embedding volunteering: In search of a new collective ground. *Voluntary Sector Review* 2: 5–21.
- Kim M, James J and Connaughton DP (2013) Comparison of volunteer motivations indifferent youth sport organizations. *European Sport Management Quarterly* 10: 343–365.
- Kim M, Chelladurai P and Trail GT (2007) A model of volunteer retention in youth sport. *Journal of Sport Management* 21: 151–171.

- Kristiansen E, Skirstad B, Parent M. and Waddington I (2015) 'We can do it': Community, resistance, social solidarity, and long-term volunteering at a sport event. *Sport Management Review* 18: 256–267.
- Lamprecht M, Fischer A and Stamm HP (2012) Die Schweizer Sportvereine – Strukturen, Leistungen, Herausforderungen [Swiss sport clubs: Structures, achievements, challenges]. Zürich: Seismo.
- Maas CJM and Hox JJ (2004) Robustness issues in multilevel regression analysis. *Statistica Neerlandica* 58: 127–137.
- Musick MA and Wilson J (2008) *Volunteers. A social profile*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Nagel S (2006) Sportvereine im Wandel. Akteurtheoretische Analysen zur Entwicklung von Sportvereinen [Sport clubs in changing times: Actor theoretical analyses of trends in sport clubs]. Schorndorf: Hofmann.
- Nagel S (2007) Akteurtheoretische Analyse der Sportvereinsentwicklung – Ein theoretisch-methodischer Bezugsrahmen [Actor theoretical analysis of the development of sports – A theoretical-methodological frame of reference]. *Sportwissenschaft* 37: 186–201.
- Nagel S, Conzelmann A and Gabler H (2004) *Sportvereine Auslaufmodell oder Hoffnungsträger* [Sports clubs - white hope or discontinued model]. Tübingen: Attempto.
- Nichols G and James M (2008). One size does not fit all: implications of sport club diversity for their effectiveness as a policy tool for government support. *Managing Leisure* 13: 104–114.
- Nichols G, Padmore J, Taylor P and Barrett D (2012) The relationship between types of sports club and English government policy to grow participation. *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics* 4: 187–200.

- Okun MA and Schultz A (2003) Age and motives for volunteering: Testing hypotheses derived from socio-emotional selectivity theory. *Psychology and Aging* 18: 231–239.
- Peters-Davis ND, Burnt CJ and Braunschweig HM (2001) Factors associated with volunteering behavior among community dwelling individuals. *Activities, Adaption, Aging* 26: 29–44.
- Peugh JL (2010) A practical guide to multilevel modeling. *Journal of School Psychology* 48: 85–112.
- Pierdzioch C, Emrich E and Balter J (2013) Ehrenamt in Sportvereinen und optimale Klubgrösse – Eine kurze Skizze [Volunteering in sports clubs and optimal club size – A brief sketch]. In: Kempf H, Nagel, S and Dietl H (eds) *Im Schatten der Sportwirtschaft* [In the shadow of sport economics]. Schorndorf: Hofmann, pp. 181–190.
- Pitsch W (1999) Ideologische Einflüsse in der empirischen Sozialforschung im Sport: aufgezeigt am Beispiel der Untersuchung von Sportvereinen [Ideological influences in empirical social research in sport: demonstrated by the example of the study of volunteer sports clubs]. Köln Strauß.
- Pitsch, W and Emrich E (1997) „Krise des Ehrenamts?“ Eine Analyse alter Daten [“Crisis of volunteering?” An analyses of old data]. *Sportwissenschaft* 27: 391-408.
- Pitsch W and Emrich E (1999) Vom Nutzen der Sinn- und der Stoffhuberei. Eine Entgegnung auf die Stellungnahme von Heinemann/Schubert zum Beitrag „Krise des Ehrenamts?“ [On the benefits of sense and the material collection. A reply to the opinion of Heinemann / Schubert to post "crisis of volunteering?"]. *Sportwissenschaft* 29: 229-233.
- Raudenbush SW and Bryk AS (2002) *Hierarchical linear models: Applications and data analysis methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Rehberg, W (2005) Altruistic individualists: Motivations for international volunteering among young adults in Switzerland. *Voluntas* 16: 109–122.
- Robinson WS (1950) Ecological correlations and the behavior of individuals. *American Sociological Review* 15: 351–357.
- Rotolo T and Wilson J (2012) State-level differences in volunteerism in the United States: Research based on demographic, institutional, and cultural macrolevel theories. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 41: 452–473.
- Scheerder J and Vos S (2010) Sportclubs in beeld. Basisrapporting over het Vlaamse Sportclub panel 2009. Leuven: University of Leuven/Research Unit of Social Kinesiology and Sport Management.
- Schimank U 2005 Der Vereinssport in der Organisationsgesellschaft: Organisationssoziologische Perspektiven auf ein Spannungsverhältnis [Club sport within the organisational society: sociological perspectives to a strained relationship]. In Alkemeyer T, Rigauer B and Sobiech G (eds) *Organisationsentwicklungen und DeInstitutionalisierungprozesse im Sport*. Schorndorf: Hofmann, pp. 21–44.
- Schlesinger T and Nagel S (2011) ‘Freiwilliges Engagement im Sportverein ist Ehrensache!’ Ein Modell zur Analyse der Mitarbeitentscheidungen in Sportvereinen [“Voluntary commitment to the sports club is a matter of honour!’ A model for analyzing decisions to volunteer in sports clubs]. *Sport and Society* 8: 3–27.
- Schlesinger T and Nagel S (2013) ‘Who will volunteer?’ Analysing individual and structural factors of volunteering in Swiss sports clubs. *European Journal of Sport Science* 13: 707–715.
- Schlesinger T, Egli B and Nagel S (2013) “Continue or terminate?” Determinants of long-term volunteering in sports clubs. *European Sport Management Quarterly* 13: 32–53.

- Schlesinger T and Nagel S (2015) Does the context matter? Analysing individual and structural factors of member commitment in sports clubs. *European Journal of Sport and Society* 12: 55–79.
- Silverberg KE, Marshall EK and Ellis GD (2001) Measuring job satisfaction of volunteers in public parks and recreation. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration*: 19, 79–92.
- Skirstad B and Hanstad DV (2013) Gender matters in sport event volunteering. *Managing Leisure* 18: 316–330.
- Snijders TA (2003) Multilevel Analysis. In: Lewis-Beck MS, Bryman AE and Liao TF (eds) *The Sage Encyclopedia of Social Science Research Methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, pp. 673–677.
- Snijders TA and Bosker, R (1999) *Multilevel analysis: An introduction to basic and advanced multilevel modeling*. London: Sage.
- Stirling C, Kilpatrick S and Orpin P (2011) A psychological contract perspective to the link between non-profit organizations' management practices and volunteer sustainability. *Human Resource Development International* 14: 321–336.
- Strigas AD and Jackson EN Jr (2003) Motivating volunteers to serve and succeed: Design and results of a pilot study that explores demographics and motivational factors in sport volunteerism. *International Sports Journal* 7:111–123.
- Studer S and von Schnurbein G (2013) Organisational factors affecting volunteers: A literature review on volunteer coordination. *Voluntas* 24: 403–440.
- Taylor P (2004) Driving up participation: Sport and volunteering. In: Sports England (ed) *Driving up participation: The challenge for sport*. London: Sport England, pp. 103–110.

- Thiel A and Mayer J (2009) Characteristics of voluntary sports clubs management: A sociological perspective. *European Sport Management Quarterly* 9: 81–98.
- Tönnies F (1963) *Community and society*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Weisbrod B A (1975) Toward a theory of the voluntary non-profit sector in a three sector economy. In: Phelps ES (ed) *Altruism, morality and economic theory*. New York: Sage, pp. 171–195.
- Wicker P and Breuer C (2011) Scarcity of resources in German non-profit sport clubs. *Sport Management Review* 14: 188–201.
- Wicker P and Breuer C (2013) Understanding the importance of organizational resources to explain organizational problems: Evidence from non-profit sport clubs in Germany. *Voluntas* 24: 461–484.
- Wicker P, Breuer C, Lamprecht M and Fischer A (2014) Does club size matter? An examination of economies of scale, economies of scope, and organizational problems. *Journal of Sport Management* 28: 266–280.
- Wicker P and Hallmann K (2013) A multi-level framework for investigating the engagement of sport volunteers. *European Sport Management Quarterly* 13: 110–139.

Table 1: Variables for analyzing voluntary commitment, their operationalization and descriptive statistics

Variable	Operationalization	Descriptive statistics
Dependent variable Voluntary commitment (Intention to quit voluntary activity)	'How often have you felt like quitting your voluntary engagement for your sport club in the past few months?' 1 (<i>often</i>) to 5 (<i>never</i>)	M = 3.7 (SD = 1.6); Yes, frequently = 9.4%; Yes, often = 6.4; Yes, sometimes = 17.8%; Yes, but only occasionally = 18.4%; never = 47.6%
Independent variables		
Individual level		
Gender	Dummy; 1 = male	Male = 70.1%; Female = 29.9%
Age	Number of years of life (> 16 years)	M = 40.6 (SD = 14.5)
Children belonging to club	Dummy; 1 = yes (≤ 16 years)	Yes = 17.2%; No = 82.8%
Competition experiences	Dummy; 1 = yes	Yes = 83.6%; No = 16.4%
Duration of club membership	Number of membership years	M = 19.3 (SD = 11.6)
Length of volunteering in the club	Number of years in voluntary work	M = 11.7 (SD = 9.5)
Average time volunteered in the club	Number of hours per month for volunteering	M = 16.6 (SD = 12.0)
Payments (up to 2000 CHF p.a.)	Dummy; 1 = yes	Yes = 33.7%; No = 66.3%
Volunteer job satisfaction	Index from 5 dimensions (z-standardized)	M = 3.90 (SD = 0.9)
Identification with the club	Index from 5 Items (z-standardized; Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.83$)	M = 4.23 (SD = 0.7)
Perceived (collective) solidarity	Index from 4 Items (z-standardized; Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.85$)	M = 4.01 (SD = 0.7)
Club level		
<i>Situational features</i>		
Members	Number of club members	M = 1,409.6 (SD = 2,152.6)
Members ²	Squared number of club members (members * members)	M = 6,612,941.4
Divisions	Number of divisions with different sports	M = 9.0 (SD = 11.8)
Community size, where the VSC is local embedded	1 = rural; 2 = agglomeration; 3 = urban; 4 = city	Rural = 10.3%; agglomeration = 29.1%; urban = 24.1%; city = 36.5%
<i>Volunteer-related features of the VSC</i>		
Problems with 'volunteering'	1 = no problems to 3 = big problems	No problems = 27.9%; medium problems = 34.3%; big problems = 37.7%
Measures to promote volunteering ^a	Index of selected items (categorized: 1 = no further measures to 3 = specific measures)	No further measures = 16.1%; scattered measures = 51.4%; specific measures = 32.5%
Strategic planning of volunteering ^b	Index of selected items (categorized: 1 = no specific coordination to 3 = coordinated)	No specific coordination = 19.3%; rather coordinated = 59.3%; coordinated = 21.3%
Immaterial/symbolic rewards	1 = no; 3 = strong	No = 31.1%; partially = 39.1%; strong = 29.8%
Material incentives	1 = no; 3 = strong	No = 50.6%; partially = 33.8%; strong = 15.6%

Paid staff within the club	Dummy; 1 = yes, paid staff	Yes = 59.9%; No = 40.1%
<i>Strategic orientation of the club</i>		
Supporting competitive sports	1 = not important to 5 = important	Not important = 5.3%; neither/nor = 11.1%; rather important = 62.8%; important = 20.8%
Supporting grassroots sports	1 = not important to 5 = important	Neither/nor = 13.7% rather important = 29.4%; important = 56.9%
Maintaining tradition	1 = not important to 5 = important	Not important = 3.2%; less important = 2.4%; neither/nor = 31.0%; rather important = 46.0%; important = 17.4%
Set value on conviviality	1 = not important to 5 = important	Less important = 7.1%; neither/nor = 27.7%; rather important = 27.9%; important = 37.3%
Supporting external cooperation	1 = not important to 5 = important	Less important = 14.1; neither/nor = 23.1%; rather important = 49.6%; important = 13.2%

Notes

^a *Measures to promote voluntary engagement* of club members include clearly defined volunteering responsibilities, specific publicity campaigns to recruit volunteers and keeping membership records. These were assessed on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (*not at all true*) to 5 (*completely true*).

^b Items include *strategic planning of volunteering* such as job descriptions, volunteer coordinator, knowledge about skills, expectations of volunteers and volunteering as topic in mission statement. These were assessed on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (*not at all true*) to 5 (*completely true*).

Table 2: Individual and contextual determinants of voluntary commitment in VSCs (random intercept, non-standardized coefficients)

	Random intercept only	Random intercept (individual)	Random intercept (individual+contextual)	Random intercept (individual+contextual)	Random intercept (individual+contextual)	Random intercept (full) model
Fixed part						
Intercept	3.935***	4.073***	4.224***	4.297***	4.083***	4.251***
Gender (1 = male)		.010	.014	.016	.015	.014
Age		-.001	-.001	-.001	-.001	-.001
Children belonging to club (1 = yes)		.346**	.331**	.334**	.326**	.323**
Competition experiences (1 = yes)		.109	.112	.108	.112	.111
Volunteer job satisfaction		.258***	.240***	.247***	.244***	.240***
Duration of club membership		-.004	-.004	-.004	-.004	-.004
Length of volunteering in the club		-.030***	-.031***	-.030***	-.031***	-.030***
Average time volunteered in the club		.003	.002	.003	.003	.002
Identification with the club		.362***	.359***	.351***	.357***	.351***
Perceived (collective) solidarity		.337***	.338***	.340***	.330***	.338***
Payments (1 = yes)		-.063	-.056	-.058	-.052	-.060
Members		--	-.001	--	--	--
Members ²		--	.000	--	--	--
Divisions		--	.004	--	--	--
Community size		--	-.127*	--	--	-.112*
Supporting competitive sports		--	--	.106*	--	.087
Supporting grassroots sports		--	--	.020	--	--
Maintaining tradition		--	--	-.031	--	--
Set value on conviviality		--	--	.132*	--	.118*
Supporting external cooperation		--	--	-.073	--	--
Paid staff within the club (1 = yes)		--	--	--	-.007	--
Measures to promote volunteering		--	--	--	.080	--
Strategic planning of volunteerism		--	--	--	.053	--
Immaterial/symbolic rewards		--	--	--	.069	--
Material incentives		--	--	--	.049	--
Random part						
Variance individual level (Var r_{ij})	1.467	1.054	1.011	.984	.996	.981
Variance contextual level (Var u_{0j})	.139	.103	.091	.083	.097	.079
Intraclass correlation coefficient (P)	.087	.089	.083	.078	.088	.075
Deviance (-2 log likelihood)	1563.6	1358.5	1335.4	1336.9	1349.4	1326.2

* $p \leq .05$; ** $p \leq .01$; *** $p \leq .001$